

Addresses

Delivered by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Charles Gore,
Lord Bishop of Oxford, *and* Mr. George
Wharton Pepper at a Luncheon Given in
Honor of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Charles Gore
at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel, Philadelphia,
Mr. Joseph Widener Presiding.



Thursday, October Thirty-first, 1918

Addresses Delivered by the
RT. REV. DR. CHARLES GORE
LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD
and
MR. GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER
at a Luncheon given in Honor of the
RT. REV. DR. CHARLES GORE
at the RITZ-CARLTON HOTEL, Philadelphia

Thursday, October Thirty-first
Nineteen Eighteen

MR. JOSEPH WIDENER Presiding

524
10/11/8

2
10/11/8

10/11/8

COMMITTEE

MR. THOMAS DEWITT CUYLER	MR. WM. ELLIS SCULL
MR. SAMUEL S. FLEISHER	MR. E. T. STOTESBURY
MR. JOHN GRIBBEL	MR. JOHN WANAMAKER
MR. GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER	MR. JOSEPH WIDENER
MR. ELI KIRK PRICE	MR. JAMES WILLCOX
MR. CHARLES M. SCHWAB	MR. CHARLTON YARNALL

ADDRESSES AT LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF THE RIGHT REVEREND
DR. CHARLES GORE, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, who is in
this country with the approval of the British Government,
on the invitation of the National Committee on the Moral
Aims of the War.

Mr. Joseph Widener: Gentlemen, I am going to ask Mr George Wharton Pepper to introduce our distinguished guest, the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Mr. George Wharton Pepper: Mr. Widener and Gentlemen: I take it that I may say on your behalf that it is always with pleasure that we extend a greeting to a distinguished representative of Great Britain, but that we take a special pleasure in extending such a greeting to the guest who is honoring us with his presence today, and in extending it to him at this particular time.

Of all the venerated institutions of England, it sometimes seems to me that we Americans have a peculiar feeling for the ancient universities of Cambridge and Oxford; and if either of them can eclipse the other in the estimation of Americans, it is Oxford. Oxford drives her roots far back into the past; and the way in which she has persisted among all the changes and chances of this mortal life has sometimes seemed to me to be a symbol of that quiet, patient perseverance, undaunted by any obstacle which has brought it about in every European war that victory has ultimately perched upon the banners of that side for which the men of England have been fighting.

And therefore it seems to me that I must be speaking your mind when I express peculiar gratification that we have with us today one whose whole life has been identified with the life of Oxford, one who has in no small degree been the source of inspiration of her sons, and one who is himself the embodiment of the Oxford spirit. His coming amongst us at this particular time, I venture to think, is peculiarly significant and happy.

There are two convictions that are very deep and real with me. One is that nothing but a peace dictated by the victorious allies to a conquered Germany can make for rest to this tired world. And the other is a sentiment that is not so popular and that you will not applaud so much; the conviction that Germany is today far from a conquered power, and that the hopes which are generally entertained here of an early peace on satisfactory

terms, are entirely unjustified by the military events of the last month, or by the progress of internal events in Germany.

On both of these points I have reason to think our guest has views of his own; on the subject of a dictated peace, and on the subject of the dangers of undue optimism in wartime, and I hope he will speak his mind.

And, finally, let me say this: That his coming seems to me to be timely, because his nation, like ours, is face to face with great problems of the education of youth to meet the difficult days that lie ahead of us. The solution may not be the same in each country. In this country I am profoundly convinced that the militaristic spirit is not likely to be a menace within the lifetime of any of us now living. Our dangers are of a different sort, and I am one of those who hope that our youth will continue to be trained in respect for discipline and respect for authority along those lines that are working out so hopefully with the men who have come under our system of universal service.

But, whatever the system of training, we all believe that we are not going to accomplish that for which we are fighting merely by the adoption of systems or by the making of international compacts. It will stand and continue to stand as the only hope for the uplift of the world, that there shall be a process of transformation and uplift of the individual man; and it is of the religious philosophy whose aims are nothing short of this that our guest is so distinguished an exponent. In taking my seat, let me say that there never was a moment when it was more important to bind closely the ties between the two great English-speaking nations. We must not allow emotion or enthusiasm over momentary contacts and associations to blind us to the fact that the ties between Great Britain and this country are going to be strained when we sit at the conference table. The conditions after the war are going to increase the strain and not diminish it; and those ties must be held if the life of the two great English-speaking nations is to be preserved. And there is no way in which any tie can be so effectually strengthened as by encouraging these personal and intelligent contacts, which always result in sympathetic understanding between strong men, when they really get an opportunity to know one another; and I know of no other man who can more hopefully establish such an understanding and more firmly bind us to the people of England than the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

ADDRESS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND DOCTOR CHARLES GORE,
LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD

Mr. Widener, Mr. Pepper and Gentlemen: I do not propose to follow the speaker over the very wide area of topics which he has touched upon, and I am afraid that his estimate of my abilities in certain particulars is very much in advance of the facts.

But it is always delightful to anyone who comes from Oxford to feel the appreciation and warmth of feeling which the name evokes. Mr. Pepper did a bold thing in comparing Cambridge and Oxford, a thing which I would not dare to do. As I do not see any Cambridge men present, if you will promise not to betray me, I cannot forget that forty years ago when the first issue of Baedeker's Guide came out, especially for the use of American visitors, it was stated that no intelligent visitor would be content to leave the country without seeing the ancient Universities of Cambridge and Oxford,—but, if time presses, Cambridge may be omitted.

But that, after all, is a matter that everybody would not agree to; and for my part, I never go to Cambridge without having my loyalty to Oxford severely shaken.

It is a pleasure so great that I can hardly describe it, for an Oxford man to come to this country at this particular period. There are certain special reasons why I should feel thrilled to be in this famous city, partly because, as I have no doubt every inhabitant knows, the home of Penn is in Bucks. Few visitors from this city and State but find their way to the original home of the family; and it is my pride and delight to preside over the original from which you take your name.

And also, if I may say so, it is a great pleasure to a person who is bred in Whig principles, and who was constantly blessed when he was young and told to be a good Christian and a good Whig, to come to the place of the Declaration of Independence. That is constantly supposed to be a rather sore subject with the inhabitants of my country, but I assure you I have been taught history by a very considerable number of more or less intelligent teachers, and when they concern themselves with that period, I don't know one of them that does not point out that the Americans were perfectly right in their controversy, and that indeed they were but asserting the principles which had lain at the heart of our struggle for independence, in our civil wars,

the century before, and which have always been the very basis on which English liberties have been built.

But, of course, it is the special circumstances of the moment that make it so thrilling an experience to come to America now. I have said it before, but I must repeat it, as very emphatically as I can, that no one who knows something of the history of your country and the diverse elements of the English race under which you are building up a great nation, can fail to be amazed at the degree of unity, in determination and enthusiasm in which in the east and west America is uniting itself in the cause of this war. I think it is something like a modern miracle, and many Americans have said to me since I have been in this country that it is actually a new experience to them that they have never before felt the pulses of national unity beating as they are beating now.

Then, of course, as I feel all that is going on around me, I glow with the desire that as England and America are now co-operating in a great cause, so there should arise out of that co-operation, a fellowship of sentiment, the like of which has never existed between us. I was privileged to be in the senate some month or five weeks ago when the French Ambassador, Mr. Jusserand, presented those beautiful vases of china, as a gift from France; and he made a very eloquent speech in which he was bold to say that sentiment was the most powerful thing in human life. Then he described the sentiment which has always united America and France; and he named the name of the man who always in your country, I notice, elicits more enthusiastic applause than any name except among the greatest of your own statesmen—I mean the name of Lafayette.

But, of course, during this time I was conscious that I felt and was even meant to feel, a little light of it. Well, now, I love France, and I always have, its literature and its genius; and I do not desire that that tie of sentiment which has united America to France should be in any kind of way either loosened or dimmed; but I do from my heart desire that out of the co-operation in the great cause which is now uniting England and America there should spring, as I fancy there generally does spring from co-operation, both among individuals and among the nations, the same sort of sentiment that has bound you to France. The President of the Senate defined the feeling of America toward France, on the occasion I referred to, as arising

out of the sense that many nations have contributed to America since America has been strong and great and flourishing, but that France was the nation which was of assistance when America was struggling and weak.

Now, we represent, of course, a great principle; and I fancy America and England have felt their need of one another and their dependence upon one another. I tell you we in England feel our need of you, and I never remember the kind of national sigh of relief such as escaped from us when we knew you had come in, and we felt there would be behind us the almost unlimited resources of America to accomplish what we had half done, when we were, as we thought, beginning to fail in the almost unaccomplishable task. We shall never forget the debt of gratitude, and what ever shall be the place assigned to America in the ultimate victory, I do not believe there will be any jealousy on our part.

And then I have no doubt that you know, as indeed I have so constantly heard it expressed, the debt which you owe through all those weary four first years of the war to our armies as well as those of Belgium and France, and to our vast silent fleet. And it is this tie of mutual obligations in face of great necessity out of which I do look for the building up of a better understanding between the two great nations, such an understanding, rooted as it is, in the unity in large part of our language and literature, as I believe will be to the welfare of both the countries concerned and the whole world.

I have been sent to this country, or brought to this country to speak about the moral aims of the war. That is my commission; and certainly every day I live amidst the extraordinarily moving tidings that seem to presage victory in the immediate future, I feel the necessity of doing anything that lies in my power to keep in men's view why we are fighting, not merely in the background of their minds, but constantly prominent. I agree wholly with what was said just now, about the perils of an excessive optimism. We have had many disillusiones and many disappointments in England, and I can see that in this country you are more naturally disposed to optimism than we are. It may be that the end is very close, but it also may not be. What I am, above all things, anxious for, is that Germany should understand, not that the end is close, but that we are determined with an unconquerable resolution that whether

the end is close or whether it is far off, this war is going on until it ends in a defeat so signal that it must be acknowledged by all the world. And that it must discredit with its own people that military despotism which hitherto has ruled the destinies of Germany.

Then, what are we fighting for—to defeat Germany, only why—? And it is there that I think what has been so constantly said by our great statesmen needs to be perpetually pushed to the front in men's minds, that it is—and I am repeating the words of our statesmen of all parties, and I think the same would be true in this country—that this is a war against war; because, I am not at all convinced that the meaning of this has been adequately taken in on all sides. It means that there is no disaster conceivably so great as that this war should end in a consummate victory, in a peace never so satisfactory, dictated by the allied nations to Germany, and by them perforce accepted, and in a rearranged Europe, with boundaries—new boundaries—never so successfully drawn—and that the nations should then return, or their representatives, to their own homes leading the nations to build up again armies and armies against one another, and after a period during which they would recover from the exhaustion of the war, begin again to eye one another with suspicion and wait until another war should break out. Truly I believe that it is not an exaggeration to say that the very foundation of the slowly built-up civilization of Europe and of America would be imperilled.

I remember reading Hilare B. Lock's extremely clever sketch which he published at the beginning of the war, during some excitement in England, in which he described so imaginatively say some 3000 A.D., the beginnings of the recovery of civilization—and which was looking back upon the total eclipse of civilization that had been in the dark ages which, I think, began about 1925, the dark ages that had followed peace after the nations that had talked about peace had done nothing to secure it, and had come back to their own countries and found themselves involved in labor wars and troubled social conditions. Meanwhile they had been eyeing one another with suspicion and European wars had broken out, first in the Balkans, then elsewhere, then elsewhere; and finally there had been another European war and that had been too much for civilization, and the world had broken down.

It was very amusing, because it was very skillful; but I totally failed to be amused. I had contemplated the eclipse of civilization, as I read history, without any particular thrill because of being so far off from the empires that came so close to ruin; but now it touched too close. I feel sure it is the wisest who, like our Lord Grey, do feel that civilization is at stake unless the nations can get rid of any such atmosphere and conditions as would cause them to use all the resources and time to build up armaments and armaments

Now, if that is to be done, how is it to be done? There is only one scheme clearly before the world. It has been outlined in practically identical lines by statesmen in both parties amongst us, by Lord Grey and by Mr. Asquith and Mr. Balfour and others—Lord Price, a notable man, who has been notably to the fore in the matter; and in France by some of the best men, and the French Foreign office and our Foreign Office are working out the scheme in detail; and, of course, this country, your President has made himself its prophet, and as far as I can see there is no substantial difference in the matter between the scheme of your President and the scheme of Mr. Taft; and they are all enthusiastic about it. But constantly as I go about in this country I feel, as I felt in my own country, that people have not thought enough about it, and that it will not effectively come about unless behind the statesmen there is the enthusiasm of the people.

Now, in England we have got the enthusiasm of the soldiers. Our soldiers who have been fighting these four years loathe the war. For them the gilt is entirely off the ginger bread. There are no pessimists in the world like the British tommies, no men in the world so determined that this war shall be a war against war; and on the whole I think our proletariat, our laboring people, with whom I have a good deal to do, I think they are absolutely solid on the subject. In speaking about it in this country I cannot but wonder whether the elements in opposition or not in somewhat strong force; and what I desire from my heart is not to seek to impose any thought of my own on people but to get people to really think about the matter and to see what is at stake.

I thought that your President's speech of five weeks ago in New York was an epoch-making speech, because it defined with such precision the very elements of difficulty among the League

of Nations; because, if the League of Nations comes about it will be a new epoch. Hitherto the nations have fought for their own liberty—Serbia, Italy, France and Belgium, and America; but each, on the whole, was helped; England helped Italy, and so on; France helped America, each fighting for its own liberty, and each maintaining a certain proud independence. We know very well with what pride you in America claimed and maintained your independence, and asked what you had to do with the squabbles of effete kings so many thousands of miles over the Atlantic. Now we have all found our mistake. The world is too small for this sort of independence. You have found it out. The means of communication have become such that you cannot separate yourselves even though the Atlantic separates you, the world has become too small; and at this moment a new thing is happening, a new thing in the history of the world. That is to say, the free nations of the world are allied to fight not for the liberty of any one but for the liberty of the world. And the great problem of the weeks that are to come—as soon, that is to say, as negotiations begin, is whether this liberty is going to be maintained, which is one principle of the League of Nations. For you are to know that since the Renaissance the jurists have built up a theory of national sovereignty which was, if I may say, atomic, each nation free from any interference outside of its own borders.

That was closely akin to the principle of individualism as regards the individual; and now the moment has arrived when there is a new and tremendous claim to be made upon the nations, namely, that as the individual must recognize that there is the individual right over the rights of property, so, over every individual right there is the welfare of the whole community, over every individual nation there is the welfare of the whole body of nations. That we do not intend that once again one nation shall be able to throw the whole world into confusion, to drench it in blood.

Now, we are not such fools, I suppose, as to try to lead you to believe that Germany alone has entertained illegitimate ambitions. Why, those very secret treaties published by the Bolsheviki two or three years ago—what do they show? This, at least, that other nations besides Germany have been entertaining illegitimate ambitions of domination. You know the history of the Balkans. You know the history of European nations.



Are we such fools as to suppose that no other Nation is going to be drunk again with ambition? No. What we want to secure is the safety of the whole world against the ambition of one, that we will not depend again upon a system of alliances which will have the whole world trembling on the verge of war, and arming itself as if war was immediately possible. Yet it is a claim you make that it does demand a modification of that principle of national sovereignty. If you take the principles as agreed upon in England, by Asquith and Balfour and Grey—and by your President, point for point, with some modifications—not what you call the reasonable independence of nations but just some modification in their international relations as regards the court of reconciliation, the court of arbitration—and in the court of arbitration about questions of honor, and the system of representation, which is a very difficult and delicate matter as affecting large nations and small—and the economic punishment to be employed against one recalcitrant member, and not to be applied except in the case of a recalcitrant member, and reduction of armies, the proportionable reduction of armies, and the international police—but all that is a large order, you see.

I don't believe that the statesmen can carry it out unless they have got the real mind of the thinking public behind them, and I see a great tendency of people to say "Let us fight this war through, and then we can think about it." But, my friends, after the war, immediately after the war, the representatives of nations will meet, and peace will be drawn upon some basis. Upon what basis, then? Will it be drawn on the right basis? If not, for my part, I seriously do not see how our civilization can escape. The whole world will be driven into militarism and military preparation. Before our reasonable, practical statesmen make a proposal what I want is to see that the minds of men should be prepared for the sacrifices which are necessary for any such League of Nations to maintain, ensure and enforce peace.

Now, I appeal to three things: I appeal, first of all, to the sort of hope which springs out of despair; because truly—I know Lord Grey's mind very intimately on this subject, and I do not believe there is any man who has been more versed in the inter-political situation in Europe,—if after the war the nations were to be left to build up armaments again against one another, and watch

one another with a jealous hostility, we cannot but contemplate the future with despair. Unless Europe will make the step forward of recognizing a supernatural authority, it looks as if the resources of science would serve for nothing but to destroy mankind. He does feel that the whole future of our civilization is in jeopardy. He has said it quite properly—I do not believe he is exaggerating one bit. But we are determined, I hope, that our civilization shall not perish. We are determined that the free nations shall not give themselves up to militarism. We are determined that the resources of our civilization shall not go to build us up—and now America—into great armed camps. And there springs out of that determination a hope, a hope which is bred of despair, because if we are resolved at all, we are resolved that that shall not be.

I believe that the greatest prophet of modern democracy was Joseph Mazzini. And among other reasons I believe he was great because he always insisted that no solid social fabric could be built upon an assertion of rights but only upon a recognition of duties.

He told them that they must look to something above nations. And I believe it is solely the democracies that are taking that in; and I know something of our working people in England. I believe they are determined in that respect. The very last thing in the world I want is to see a war of sentiment between labor and capital, which shall coincide with the sentiment of peace, on the one side, and of military preparations on the other. I can conceive of no disaster in my own country—I don't attempt to speak for yours—greater than that in the years that are coming the laboring people should be for the League of Nations and that it should appear that the great interests have been against it. I think that would be more liable to bring revolution; but from my heart I hope there will be freedom and justice within the nation. I think it was Erasmus who in the Sixteenth Century noted first that war was always made between autocracies and democracies, and the common people are in favor of peace. And on the whole, in spite of exceptions, I believe that to be true.

But I want to appeal to the Church of Christ. The Church of Christ has forgotten so ludicrously that it is a Catholic institution, that it ought never to be understood to be in favor of National war; that if it is to be true in any way to Christ and

St. Paul it is to be a fellowship of all Nations, binding them together by a tie closer even than the tie of blood. We have been lamentably forgetful of our Catholic vocation, but I think we have an opportunity now.

Now the League of Nations is far different from the Catholic Church, but I believe the League of Nations, based on the National and International fraternity of men, would be a step so far ahead in the awakening of entire Christendom that it will be not only supported by National interest but shall reach back to the establishment of International fellowship.

So, it is upon the hope which springs in the hearts of all men for civilization; and it is to the great feeling of democracy and to the instinct of the Christian church I desire to appeal. But I am not in the least satisfied that at present the Church is fulfilling its duties. I think in my country the Church is simply uttering the ordinary feelings of the men on the street—legitimate feelings, but not the feelings of the Church of Christ, that this is a war against war, and that there is no way to secure us against war except the establishment of peace on a basis which shall make it free from dissensions and shall organize the League of Free Nations on the International, Supernational fellowship of men.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 547 598 0